1172. i 1
10

AN ACCOUNT OF THE LIFE AND WRITINGS OF THE LATE WILLIAM HUNTER, M.D. F.R.S. and S.A.

MEMBER of the ROYAL COLLEGE of PHYSICIANS,
PHYSICIAN EXTRAORDINARY to the QUEEN,
Conſulting PHYSICIAN to the BRITISH LYING-IN HOSPITAL,
AND
Profeſſor of ANATOMY in the ROYAL ACADEMY of LONDON;
One of the FOREIGN ASSOCIATES of the ROYAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, and of the ROYAL MEDICAL SOCIETY at PARIS, &c.

Read, on the 6th of Auguſt 1783,
At a General Meeting of the
SOCIETY of PHYSICIANS of LONDON,
Of which He was
PRESIDENT,
And publiſhed at their Requeſt.

BY

SAMUEL FOART SIMMONS, M.D. F.R.S.
Member of the Royal College of Phyſicians, London;
Honorary Fellow of the Royal College of Phyſicians of Lorraine; and one of the Foreign Aſſociates of the Royal Medical Society at Paris.

LONDON:
Printed for the AUTHOR, by W. RICHARDSON,
And ſold by J. JOHNSON, N° 72, St. Paul's Church-yard,
MDCCLXXXIII.

MVSEVM
BRITAN
NICVM

TO

WILLIAM WATSON, M.D. V.P.R.S.

Truſt. Br. Muſ. &c.

PRESIDENT;

WILLIAM GRANT, M.D. &c.

TREASURER;

MAXWELL GARTHSHORE, M.D.F.R.S.&c.

SECRETARY;

AND THE OTHER MEMBERS OF THE

SOCIETY OF PHYSICIANS OF LONDON;

The following Tribute of Reſpect to the Memory of

DR. WILLIAM HUNTER,

THEIR LATE PRESIDENT,

IS WITH GREAT DEFERENCE INSCRIBED,

BY THEIR AFFECTIONATE COLLEAGUE

AND OBLIGED HUMBLE SERVANT,

SAMUEL FOART SIMMONS.

TO

WILLIAM WATSON, M.D. V.P.R.S.

Prof. Br. Med. &c.

PRESIDENT;

WILLIAM GRANT, M.D. &c.

TREASURER;

MAXWELL GARTHSHORE, M.D. F.R.S. &c.

SECRETARY;

AND THE OTHER MEMBERS OF THE

SOCIETY OF PHYSICIANS OF LONDON;

The following Tribute is Inscribed to the Memory of

DR. WILLIAM HUNTER,

THEIR LATE PRESIDENT;

IS WITH GREAT DEFERENCE INSCRIBED,

BY THEIR AFFECTIONATE COLLEAGUE

AND OBLIGED—HUMBLE SERVANT,

SAMUEL FOART SIMMONS.

ADVERTISEMENT.

WHEN I engaged in the following Biographical Eſſay, at the requeſt of the Society of Phyſicians, I was aware that without conſiderable aſſiſtance my account of Dr. Hunter would be very imperfect.—The information I wanted has been ſupplied by the kindneſs of different friends, to whom I embrace this opportunity of acknowledging my obligations.—For much of the early part of Dr. Hunter's hiſtory I am indebted to Dr. Cullen. Mr. Matthew Baillie has favoured me with an account of Dr. Hunter's unpubliſhed writings, and with other materials. My thanks are due likewiſe

wise to Dr. Pitcairn, Dr. Bromfield, Dr. Denman, Mr. John Hunter, Mr. Henry Watson, and Mr. Charles Combe, for different communications, of which I have availed myself in the course of the work.

ERRATA.

P. 3, & 13, *for* sat out, *read* set out.

P. 15, *in the note concerning Dr. Sandys, after the word* died, *Add* in 1771.

AN

AN ACCOUNT OF THE LIFE AND WRITINGS OF THE LATE WILLIAM HUNTER, M.D.

WILLIAM HUNTER was born on the 23d of May, 1718, at Kilbride, in the county of Lanerk. He was the ſeventh of ten children* of John and Agnes Hunter, who reſided

* Theſe were John, Elizabeth, Andrew, Janet, James, Agnes, William, Dorothea, Iſabella, and John. Of the Sons, John the eldeſt, and Andrew died young; James, born in 1715, was a writer to the ſignet at Edinburgh, who, diſliking the profeſſion of the law, came to London in 1743, with an intention to ſtudy anatomy under his brother William, but was prevented from purſuing this plan by ill health, which induced him to return to Long Calderwood, where he died ſoon after, aged 28

 years;

ſided on a ſmall eſtate in that pariſh, called Long Calderwood, which had long been in the poſſeſſion of his family. His great grandfather, by his father's ſide, was a younger ſon of Hunter of Hunterſton, chief of the family of that name.

At the age of fourteen his father ſent him to the college of Glaſgow. In this ſeminary he paſſed five years, and by his prudent behaviour and diligence acquired the eſteem of the profeſſors, and the reputation of being a good ſcholar.

His father had deſigned him for the church, but the idea of ſubſcribing to articles of faith, was ſo repugnant to the liberal mode of thinking he had already adopted, that he felt an inſuperable averſion to his theological purſuits. In this ſtate of mind he happened to become acquainted with Dr. Cullen, the preſent cele-

years; John, the youngeſt, is the preſent celebrated anatomiſt.—Of the daughters, Elizabeth, Agnes, and Iſabella, died young; Janet married Mr. Buchanan of Glaſgow, and died in 1749; Dorothea, who is ſtill living, married the late Rev. James Baillie, D. D. profeſſor of divinity in the univerſity of Glaſgow, by whom ſhe has a ſon Matthew Baillie, of Baliol College, Oxford, B. A. and two daughters.

brated

brated profeſſor at Edinburgh, who was then juſt eſtabliſhed in practice at Hamilton, under the patronage of the Duke of Hamilton. Dr. Cullen's converſation ſoon determined him to lay aſide all thoughts of the church, and to devote himſelf to the profeſſion of phyſic.

His father's conſent having been previouſly obtained, Mr. Hunter, in 1737, went to reſide with Dr. Cullen. In the family of this excellent friend and preceptor he paſſed nearly three years, and theſe, as he has been often heard to acknowledge, were the happieſt years of his life. It was then agreed, that he ſhould go and proſecute his medical ſtudies at Edinburgh and London, and afterwards return to ſettle at Hamilton, in partnerſhip with Dr. Cullen.

Speaking to me of the manners and diſpoſition of his friend at this period Dr. Cullen obſerved, that his converſation was remarkably lively and agreeable, and his whole conduct at the ſame time more ſtrictly and ſteadily correct than that of any other young perſon he had ever known. The ſame chearfulneſs and the ſame regard for prudence accompanied him through life.

He ſet out for Edinburgh in November 1740, and continued there till the following ſpring,

attending the lectures of the medical profeſſors, and amongſt others thoſe of the late Dr. Alexander Monro, who many years afterwards in alluſion to this circumſtance ſtiled himſelf his "old maſter *."

Mr. Hunter arrived in London in the ſummer of 1741, and took up his reſidence at Mr. afterwards Dr. Smellie's, who was at that time an apothecary in Pall-mall. He brought with him a letter of recommendation to his countryman Dr. James Douglas, from Mr. Foulis, printer at Glaſgow, who had been uſeful to the doctor in collecting for him different editions of Horace †. Dr. Douglas was then intent on a great anatomical work on the bones, which he did not live to complete, and was looking out for a young man of abilities and induſtry whom

* Supplement to the Med. Comment.

† Dr. Douglas, with great induſtry and expence, in the courſe of a number of years, made a collection of all the editions of Horace which had been publiſhed from the year 1476 to the year 1739. Dr. Harwood, who mentions this circumſtance in his View of the various editions of the Greek and Roman claſſics, obſerves, that this one author alone, thus multiplied, muſt have conſtituted a very conſiderable library. A very accurate detail of theſe different editions is prefixed to the firſt volume of Watſon's Horace.

he

he might employ as a diſſector. This induced him to pay particular attention to Mr. Hunter, and finding him acute and ſenſible, he deſired him to make him another viſit. A ſecond converſation confirmed the doctor in the good opinion he had formed of Mr. Hunter, and without any farther heſitation he invited him into his family to aſſiſt in his diſſections, and to ſuperintend the education of his ſon.

Mr. Hunter having communicated this offer to his father and Dr. Cullen, the latter readily and heartily gave his concurrence to it; but his father, who was very old and infirm, and expected his return with impatience, conſented with reluctance to a ſcheme the ſucceſs of which he thought precarious. By the favour of Dr. Hunter's executors, I have ſeen the letter he wrote on this occaſion to his ſon. In this letter he ſays, "Nothing has proved a greater comfort "than the hopes of ſeeing you here ſoon; but "your letter has caſt a very great damp upon "us all. I think you have been in a very ex"traordinary manner obliged to Dr. Douglas, "and whatever opinion I may have of his pre"ſent offer, or however unwilling I may be to "conſent to it, ſtill I muſt thankfully own it, "as a particular inſtance of his kindneſs to you.

"I

" I ſurely muſt ſoon expect to be beyond this
" ſide of time, conſiderIng my age and preſent
" indiſpoſition, being for ſome days paſt con-
" fined to my bed with ſickneſs, and a ſevere
" fit of the gravel, and would be glad to have
" you near me for the little while I ſhall be in
" this world; though at the ſame time I ſhould
" be ſorry to hinder you from making your
" way in the world, the beſt way you can.—I
" wiſh you to conſider well what you do.—
" With Dr. Cullen you may be very comfort-
" ably ſettled, and make money, and if you
" miſs this opportunity now, you cannot be
" ſure of it at another time.——Dr. Douglas's
" kind offer is only for a time. He may die
" before you come home or are ſettled, and
" leave you without friends at a great enough
" uncertainty. I ſuppoſe now you know very well
" the difference between the expence of living
" at home and abroad, and that perhaps cloaths
" and pocket-money may coſt you more than
" your whole expence at home would do. You
" know my willingneſs to aſſiſt you, but you
" know too, that already I have gone fully as
" far as my numerous family will allow of.—
" You muſt now do ſomething for yourſelf.
" —Conſider all theſe things, and if you can

" perſuade

" perſuade me that it is for your good, I will " not be againſt it."

This was the language of a plain ſenſible man, anxious for the welfare of his ſon; and although it failed to produce the effect he wiſhed for, it probably ſerved as an excitement to induſtry.

His father did not long ſurvive the writing of this letter. It is dated at Long Calderwood, July 28, 1741, and he died on the 30th of October following, aged ſeventy-eight years.

Mr. Hunter having accepted Dr. Douglas's invitation was by his friendly aſſiſtance enabled to enter himſelf as a ſurgeon's pupil at Saint George's Hoſpital under Mr. James Wilkie, and as a diſſecting pupil under Dr. Frank Nichols, who at that time taught anatomy with conſiderable reputation. He likewiſe attended a courſe of lectures on experimental philoſophy by Dr. Deſaguliers.

Of theſe means of improvement he did not fail to make a proper uſe. He ſoon became expert in diſſection, and Dr. Douglas was at the expence of having ſeveral of his preparations engraved. But before many months had elapſed, he had the misfortune to loſe this excellent

cellent friend. Dr. Douglas died on the firſt of April, 1742, in his 67th year, leaving a widow * and two children.

This event, the probability of which his father had pointed out to him, does not ſeem to have retarded his progreſs. Such a loſs, and at ſo critical a period, would probably have deſtroyed the hopes of any man of leſs abilities or induſtry than he poſſeſſed. But he ſeems by this time to have had a conſciouſneſs of the ſuperiority of his talents, and he who feels himſelf equal to great things will not eaſily be diſmayed.

* Mrs. Douglas ſurvived her huſband till May 5, 1752, when ſhe departed this life at the age of 63 years. Her daughter, Jane Martha Douglas, died in 1744, aged 28; her ſon, James Douglas, who ſet out in life with the faireſt proſpect, ruined himſelf by his indiſcretion, and died about the year 1755, aged 30 years. It has been injuriouſly reported of Dr. Hunter, that he ſuffered his friend's ſon to languiſh in poverty, without adminiſtering to his wants. The truth is, that Dr. Hunter, after lending him at different times a larger ſum than he could conveniently ſpare, was obliged to abandon him to his imprudence. Mr. Douglas's notes of hand to the amount of about 100l. are in the poſſeſſion of Dr. Hunter's executors.

The

The death of Dr. Douglas made no change in his ſituation. He continued to reſide with the doctor's family, and to purſue his ſtudies with the ſame diligence as before.

In 1743 he communicated to the Royal Society an Eſſay on the Structure and Diſeaſes of articulating Cartilages *. This ingenious paper, on a ſubject which till then had not been ſufficiently inveſtigated, affords a ſtriking teſtimony of the rapid progreſs he had made in his anatomical inquiries.

After ſome fruitleſs attempts by macerating and boiling cartilages in different menſtrua, he had fallen upon a method not only of bringing their fibrous texture to view, but of tracing the direction and arrangement of thoſe fibres. He found that when an articulating cartilage was well prepared, it felt ſoft, and yielded to the touch, but reſtored itſelf to its former equality of ſurface when the preſſure was taken off. This ſurface, when viewed through a glaſs, appeared like a piece of velvet. Thus he compared the texture of a cartilage to the pile of velvet, its fibres riſing up from the bone, as the ſilky threads of that riſe from the woven cloth or

* Phil. Tranſ. vol. XLII.

baſis. Theſe perpendicular fibres he conſidered as forming the greateſt part of the cartilaginous ſubſtance, but he was of opinion that there are likewiſe tranſverſe fibres, which connect them and make the whole a ſolid body, though theſe laſt are not eaſily ſeen, becauſe, being very tender, they are deſtroyed in preparing the cartilages.

As he had it in contemplation to teach Anatomy, his attention was directed principally to this object; and it deſerves to be mentioned as an additional mark of his prudence, that he did not precipitately engage in this attempt, but paſſed ſeveral years in acquiring ſuch a degree of knowledge, and ſuch a collection of preparations as might inſure him ſucceſs.

Dr. Nichols, to whom he communicated his ſcheme, and who declined giving lectures about that time in favour of the late Dr. Lawrence, did not give him much encouragement to proſecute it. But at length an opportunity preſented itſelf for the diſplay of his abilities as a teacher.

A ſociety of navy ſurgeons had an apartment in Covent Garden, where they engaged the late Mr. Samuel Sharpe to deliver a courſe of lectures on the operations of ſurgery. Mr. Sharpe continued to repeat this courſe, till finding that it

it interfered too much with his other engagements, he declined the taſk in favour of Mr. Hunter, who gave the ſociety ſo much ſatisfaction that they requeſted him to extend his plan to Anatomy, and at firſt he had the uſe of their room for his lectures. This happened in the winter of 1746.

He is ſaid to have experienced much ſolicitude when he began to ſpeak in public, but the applauſe he met with ſoon inſpired him with courage; and by degrees he became ſo fond of teaching, that for many years before his death he was never happier than when employed in delivering a lecture.

The profits of his two firſt courſes were conſiderable*, but by contributing to the wants of different

* My friend Mr. Watſon, F. R. S. who was one of Mr. Hunter's earlieſt pupils, has told me that he accompanied him home after his introductory lecture. Mr. Hunter, who had received about ſeventy guineas from his pupils, and had got the money in a bag under his cloak, obſerved to Mr. Watſon that it was a larger ſum than he had ever been maſter of before.—Dr. Pulteney, in his life of Linnæus, has not thought it ſuperfluous to record the ſlender beginning from which that great naturaliſt roſe to eaſe and affluence in life. "*Exivi patria* "*triginti ſex nummis aureis dives*" are Linnæus's own words.

different friends, he found himſelf at the return of the next ſeaſon obliged to defer his lectures for a fortnight, merely becauſe he had not money enough to defray the neceſſary expence of advertiſements. This circumſtance, which he himſelf mentioned to me, taught him to be more reſerved in this reſpect, particularly as he found that by thus diſtreſſing himſelf, he had only encouraged the idleneſs of his companions. As he had always an averſion to borrowing, he now determined to be cautious of lending money, and by adhering to this prudent rule, and ſtrict œconomy, he was afterwards enabled to amaſs that great fortune of which he made ſo liberal a uſe.

In 1747 † he was admitted a member of the Corporation of Surgeons, and in the ſpring of the following year *, ſoon after the cloſe of his lec-

words. Anecdotes of this ſort deſerve to be recorded as an encouragement to young men, who with great merit poſſeſs but little advantages of fortune.

† Auguſt 6.

* I had ſome difficulty in aſcertaining the date of this tour to the Continent, till Dr. Pitcairne recollected that Mr. Hunter brought him a copy of the *Codex Medicamentarius*, which was publiſhed at Paris juſt as he was ſetting out on his return home. The date of this work, which appeared in 1748, fixes the time of the excurſion in queſtion to that year.

tures, he ſet out in company with his pupil, Mr. James Douglas, on a tour through Holland to Paris.

Of this excurſion to the Continent I have no anecdotes to relate, except that at Leyden he paid his reſpects to the celebrated Albinus, who amongſt other things ſhewed him a preparation of the membrana pupillaris, and whoſe admirable injections, as he afterwards told Dr. Cullen, inſpired him with a ſtrong emulation to excel in that elegant and curious part of anatomy.

His lectures ſuffered no interruption by this journey, as he returned to England ſoon enough to prepare for his winter courſe, which began about the uſual time.

At firſt he practiſed both ſurgery and midwifery, but to the former of theſe he had always an averſion. His patron, Dr. James Douglas, had acquired conſiderable reputation in midwifery, and this probably induced Mr. Hunter to direct his views chiefly to the ſame line of practice. His being elected one of the ſurgeon-men-midwives firſt † to the Middleſex, and ſoon afterwards ‖ to the Britiſh Lying-in Hoſpital, aſſiſted in bringing him forward in this branch

† 1748. ‖ 1749.

of

of his profeſſion, in which he was recommended by ſeveral of the moſt eminent ſurgeons of that time, who reſpected his anatomical talents and wiſhed to encourage him.

But theſe were not the only circumſtances that contributed to his ſucceſs. He owed much to his abilities, and much to his perſon and manner, which eminently qualified him for the practice of midwifery, and ſoon gave him a decided ſuperiority over his countryman Dr. Smellie, who, to the weight of great experience, united the reputation he had juſtly acquired by his lectures and writings: but his perſon is ſaid to have been coarſe, and his manner aukward and unpleaſing, ſo that he never roſe into any great eſtimation amongſt perſons of rank.

The moſt lucrative part of the practice of midwifery was at that time in the hands of Sir Richard Manningham and Dr. Sandys*. The former

* Francis Sandys, M. D. for ſome time profeſſor of anatomy at Cambridge, was a moſt aſſiduous and able anatomiſt, and had a large collection of anatomical preparations. He had all the parts of the eye finely prepared and preſerved, and elegantly expreſſed in drawings. He was alſo very curious in his injections, and diſcovered the art of making them pellucid with oil of turpentine.

former of theſe died, and the latter retired into the country a few years after Mr. Hunter began to be known in midwifery.—I have been the more particular in tracing theſe circumſtances, as the fortune of his life ſeems to have turned chiefly on his ſucceſs at this period.

Although by theſe incidents he was eſtabliſhed in the practice of midwifery, it is well known that in proportion as his reputation increaſed, his opinion was eagerly ſought after in all caſes where any light concerning the ſeat or nature of the diſeaſe could be expected from an intimate knowledge of anatomy.

In 1750 he ſeems to have entirely relinquiſhed his views in ſurgery, as in that year he obtained the degree of Doctor of Phyſic † from the Univerſity of Glaſgow, and began to practiſe as a phyſician. About this time he quitted the family of Mrs. Douglas, and went to reſide in Jermyn-ſtreet.

turpentine. Dr. Hunter, in his Medical Commentaries, mentions him as the diſcoverer of the *membrana pupillaris*. He died in a retired ſituation in Bedfordſhire at a very advanced age. His collection was firſt in the poſſeſſion of Mr. Bromfeild, and afterwards ſold for 200 l. to Dr. Hunter.

† The diploma is dated Oct. 24, 1750.

In

In the ſummer of 1751 he re-viſited his native country, for which he always retained a cordial affection. His mother ‖ was ſtill living at Long Calderwood, which was now become his property by the death of his brother James. Dr. Cullen, for whom he always entertained a ſincere regard, was then eſtabliſhed at Glaſgow §, and

‖ Mrs. Hunter died Nov. 3, 1751, aged 66 years.

§ In an erroneous account of Dr. Hunter, which has appeared in different prints, we are told, that about the time of his coming to London, Dr. Cullen, through the intereſt of a nobleman of high rank, was appointed to a Profeſſorſhip in the Univerſity of Glaſgow. But this is not true. Dr. Cullen remained at Hamilton till the year 1743, that is, two years after his friend had quitted it. The Duke of Hamilton, under whoſe patronage he had ſettled there, died in that year, leaving a ſucceſſor, under age, and of courſe not likely ſoon to eſtabliſh a family at Hamilton. This induced Dr. Cullen to remove to Glaſgow. In the year 1744, at the deſire of the univerſity, and with the conſent of the then Profeſſor of Phyſic, he began to read on the Inſtitutes and Practice of Phyſic, and a few years afterwards the profeſſor reſigned his chair to him. But in this matter no nobleman had any ſhare. He owed his ſucceſs ſolely to his own abilities and exertions. It is true, however, that while he was a profeſſor at Glaſgow, and employed in teaching chemiſtry, he had the honour of becoming known

and had acquired conſiderable reputation both as a practitioner and teacher of phyſic; ſo that the two friends had the pleaſure of being able to congratulate each other on their mutual proſperity.

During this viſit he ſhewed his attachment to his little paternal inheritance, by giving many inſtructions for repairing and improving it, and for purchaſing any adjoining lands that might be offered for ſale. As he and Dr. Cullen were riding one day in a low part of the country, the latter, pointing out to him Long Calderwood at a conſiderable diſtance, remarked how conſpicuous it appeared. "Well"—ſaid he, with ſome degree of energy—"if I live I ſhall make it "ſtill more conſpicuous."

After this journey to Scotland, to which he devoted only a few weeks, he was never abſent from London, unleſs his profeſſional engagements, as ſometimes happened, required his attendance at a diſtance from the capital.

In 1755, on the reſignation of Dr. Layard, one of the phyſicians of the Britiſh Lying-in

known to the late Archibald Duke of Argyle, and by his Grace's patronage he procured, in the year 1755, a Profeſſorſhip in the Univerſity of Edinburgh. The miſtake ſeems to have originated in this circumſtance.

Hoſpital, we find the governors of that inſtitution voting their "thanks to Dr. Hunter for the "ſervices he had done the hoſpital, and for his "continuing in it as one of the phyſicians*;" ſo that he ſeems to have been eſtabliſhed in this office without the uſual form of an election. The year following† he was admitted a licentiate of the Royal College of Phyſicians, and ſoon afterwards was elected a member of the Medical Society. His hiſtory of an Aneuriſm of the Aorta appears in the firſt volume of their obſervations and inquiries publiſhed in 1757. Of this and his other eſſays in the different volumes of that collection, I ſhall here give ſome account, that it may be ſeen how much he contributed to its utility.

In the firſt volume, to the hiſtory of the aneuriſm juſt now mentioned, he has added ſome remarks on aneuriſms in general. With a view to ſettle the diſputes concerning the nature of diſeaſes of this ſort, he propoſes a diviſion of them into three kinds rather than into two, as had been commonly done by preceding writers.

* Extracted from the minutes of the Weekly Committee of the Hoſpital, dated June 20, 1755.

† Sept. 30, 1756.

Thus,

Thus, he obſerves, that aneuriſms are either *true*, *falſe*, or *mixed*. The firſt of theſe ſpecies he aſcribes to a dilatation, and the ſecond to a rupture of the arterial coats; the third, he thinks, is brought on by both theſe cauſes united.—He proves from his own obſervation in five caſes, that ſuch a diſeaſe as the *true* aneuriſm may exiſt. This propoſition, though generally allowed, had been denied by ſome authors, who had imagined that in every aneuriſm the arterial coats are not ſimply dilated, but ruptured.

In the courſe of theſe remarks Dr. Hunter firſt mentioned a particular ſpecies of aneuriſm, of which he afterwards * treated more at large. This diſeaſe, which till his account of it appeared had been totally overlooked, occurs where an artery has been opened through a vein, and a communication is afterwards kept up between the two veſſels. At the ſuggeſtion of Dr. Cleghorn || it has ſince been diſtinguiſhed by the name of *aneuriſmal varix*. As it ſoon comes to nearly a permanent ſtate, it is of importance to be able to diſtinguiſh it from the common ſpurious aneuriſm, as the latter requires chirurgical

* Medical Obſervations and Inquiries, Vols. II. and IV.
|| Ibid. Vol. III.

aſſiſtance, while the aneuriſmal varix, if left to itſelf, is productive of no ill conſequence. A knowledge of this diſeaſe muſt therefore be conſidered as a uſeful acquiſition to ſurgery.

In the ſecond volume we find ſeveral papers by Dr. Hunter. The firſt relates to an inſtance of emphyſema, in which relief was obtained by ſcarifications. This caſe ſerved to confirm the utility of a practice, which had been recommended by former writers, particularly by Ambroſe Paré, who relates a memorable inſtance of its good effects.

To his deſcription of this caſe Dr. Hunter adds ſome remarks on the cellular membrane and its diſeaſes.—Haller has conſidered this membrane as the inorganic baſis of all our organized and vaſcular ſolids; but Dr. Hunter, in this paper, obſerves, that as the inorganic ſtamina of the human body are too minute to be ſeen, it is impoſſible to determine their real nature with certainty; but he affirms, that all its viſible parts are of a vaſcular texture.

He remarks, that the cellular membrane is of two kinds, reticular and adipoſe; and he differs from former anatomiſts, who had ſuppoſed, that the oil of the adipoſe membrane is lodged in the ſame cavities as the waters of the anaſarca.

Wherever

Wherever there is fat in the human body, he thinks there is a particular organization or glandular apparatus ſuperadded to the reticular membrane, conſiſting of veſicles for lodging the animal oil, as well as veſſels fitted for its ſecretion; ſo that he compares the marrow in the bones to the glandular or follicular parts of the adipoſe membrane, and the net-work of bony fibres and laminæ, which ſupports the marrow, to the reticular membrane that is mixed with and ſupports the adeps.

In treating of the diſeaſes of the cellular membrane, he mentions the anaſarca. In caſes of this ſort the methods of diſcharging the water had been different. Some writers had recommended inciſions of conſiderable length and depth; while others adviſed very ſmall punctures. Dr. Hunter gives the preference to the latter, as being leſs painful, and leſs liable to inflammation and mortification. It ſeems that he had tried both theſe methods, one on each leg of the ſame patient, and by that means had clearly ſeen the advantage of the one method over the other.

In this paper we meet with a good deſcription of the dropſy of the ovarium, a diſeaſe in which it had been propoſed by ſome modern ſurgeons of great reputation to attempt a radical cure by inci-

ſion

ſion and ſuppuration, or by the exciſion of the cyſt. Dr. Hunter, who was always cautious in adopting any new operation where the chance of ſucceſs ſeemed inadequate to the certainty of danger, clearly proves that exciſion can hardly be attempted; and that inciſion and ſuppuration can be recommended only under very particular circumſtances.

His other papers in this ſecond volume are, 1. An account of a diſeaſed Tibia, which ſhews that a callus will ſupply the place of a bone, and preſerve the length and firmneſs of a limb, when the greateſt part of the original bone is become uſeleſs, or thrown out by exfoliation; and 2. Remarks on the ſymphyſis of the Oſſa Pubis, which he deſcribes as a compoſition of two cartilages and a ligament, ſomewhat like the connecting ſubſtance between the bodies of the vertebræ. Several caſes that had occurred to him ſufficiently proved, that in lying-in women there may be a cavity in the ſymphyſis of the oſſa pubis, and he conſidered this obſervation as one ſtep towards explaining why matter is ſometimes collected there.

In the fourth volume he relates a caſe, which ſerved to confirm his own and M. de Haller's theory concerning the inſenſibility of tendons; and

in

in that and the fifth volumes he communicated his obſervations on the Retroverted Uterus. This diſeaſe, although it had been mentioned by M. Gregoire in his lectures at Paris, and my friend, M. Peyrilhe, the learned author of a Hiſtory of Surgery *, thinks he has diſcovered ſome traces of it in the writings of the ancients, was certainly not underſtood till Dr. Hunter deſcribed it, firſt in his lectures in 1754, and afterwards in one of the volumes of the work in queſtion, ſince which it has been generally known. It is worthy of obſervation, however, that within two years before the publication of that volume two pregnant women had loſt their lives by this accident, in London. In both of theſe inſtances experienced practitioners ſaw with regret in the dead body what they might have eaſily cured in the living, if they had made a very obvious diſcovery in proper time.

The ſixth volume, which is now in the preſs, will contain three papers written by Dr. Hunter. In one of theſe he deſcribes three caſes, by way of ſupplement to an inſtance communicated by Dr. Pulteney, of an extraordinary conformation of

* Hiſtoire de la Chirurgie depuis ſon origine juſqu'à nos jours. Vol. II. 4to. Paris, 1780.

the

the heart. In the ſecond paper he relates the hiſtory of an obſtinate diſeaſe of the ſtomach cured by the uſe of milk in ſmall quantities; and in the third he treats of the uncertainty of the ſigns of murder in the caſe of baſtard children.

In 1762 we find him warmly engaged in controverſy, ſupporting his claim to different anatomical diſcoveries, in a work entitled Medical Commentaries, the ſtyle of which is correct and ſpirited. As an excuſe for the tardineſs with which he brought forth this work, he obſerves in his introduction, that it required a good deal of time, and he had little to ſpare; that the ſubject was unpleaſant, and therefore he was very ſeldom in the humour to take it up.

In this publication he confined himſelf chiefly to a diſpute with the preſent learned profeſſor of anatomy at Edinburgh, concerning injections of the teſticle, the ducts of the lachrymal gland, the origin and uſe of the lymphatic veſſels, and abſorption by veins. He likewiſe defended himſelf againſt a reproach thrown upon him by Profeſſor Monro, ſenior, by giving a conciſe account of a controverſy he was involved in with Mr. Pott, concerning the diſcovery of the Hernia Congenita. It was not long before Mr. Pott

took

took occaſion to give the public his account of the diſpute; and, in reply, Dr. Hunter added a ſupplement to his Commentaries.

It has been obſerved of anatomiſts that they are all liable to the error of being ſevere on each other in their diſputes. Dr. Hunter, whoſe own writings * afford us this remark, very pleaſantly adds, that for any thing we know, the paſſive ſubmiſſion of dead bodies, their common objects, may render them leſs able to bear contradiction. "It is remarkable,"—ſays he,—"that there is ſcarce a conſiderable cha-"racter in anatomy that is not connected with "ſome warm controverſy. Anatomiſts have "ever been engaged in contention. And in-"deed, if a man has not ſuch a degree of en-"thuſiaſm, and love of the art, as will make "him impatient of unreaſonable oppoſition, "and of encroachments upon his diſcoveries "and his reputation, he will hardly become "conſiderable in anatomy, or in any other "branch of natural knowledge.

"Theſe reflections afford ſome comfort to "me, who unfortunately have been already

* Supplement to the firſt part of Medical Commentaries.

" engaged in two public diſputes. I have imi-
" tated ſome of the greateſt characters, in what
" is commonly reckoned their worſt part; but
" I have alſo endeavoured to be uſeful; to im-
" prove and diffuſe the knowledge of anatomy:
" and ſurely it will be allowed here, that if I
" have not been ſerviceable to the public in this
" way, it has not been for want of diligence or
" love of the ſervice *."

With regard to the injection of the teſticle it may be remarked, that Dr. Monro filled the *tubuli teſtis* with mercury in 1753; and that Dr. Hunter proves his having ſhewed a preparation † of this kind at his lectures in 1752; but that Haller has ſince claimed the merit of having made and publiſhed this diſcovery ſo early as the year 1745 ‖.

* Supplement to the Medical Commentaries.

† Dr. Hunter acknowledges that it was Mr. Henry Watſon who firſt ſhewed him the ducts coming out from the *teſtis* to form the *epididymis*, in a preparation where he had traced them by diſſection with great accuracy. See Med. Com. p. 2.

‖ " Hunterus ſe anno 1752 teſtem cum ſuis vaſis
" argento vivo repleviſſe monet; nos anno 1745 de-
" ſcripſeramus, et in programmate Winklerianæ diſpu-
" tationi addito, et in Philoſ. Tranſ." Halleri *Bibliotb. Anatom.*

The

The ducts of the lachrymal gland after the diſcovery of them in the ox, by Stenon, had been often obſerved both in that animal and in the ſheep. Santorini and Winſlow had even ſeen and deſcribed them in the human ſubject; but ſome of the moſt diſtinguiſhed modern anatomiſts had ſought for them in vain, ſo that their exiſtence in man was ſtill a ſubject of diſpute when Dr. Hunter began to teach anatomy.

It appears that at his lectures in 1747 he introduced briſtles into the ducts of this gland in the human ſubject. Dr. Monro did the ſame thing in 1753. The reputation that could be derived from this circumſtance, was hardly adequate to the warmth with which it was claimed by either of the diſputants. It could not be the reputation of a firſt diſcovery, it was merely the credit of having demonſtrated that which had eſcaped the penetration of Morgagni and Haller.

In the diſpute concerning the origin and uſe of the lymphatic veſſels, the eagerneſs of the contending parties was perhaps more excuſable. The diſcovery was extremely intereſting to the practice of phyſic and ſurgery, and the emulation of two anatomiſts who diſputed with each other the honour of the invention, would naturally

turally be in proportion to the importance of the ſubject.

Dr. Hunter, in his account of the controverſy, obſerves, that when he began to give lectures the moſt commonly received opinion concerning the lymphatic veins was, that they were a continuation of lymphatic arteries; but that he, on the contrary, was led to conſider them as a ſyſtem of abſorbing veſſels, which begin from all the internal and external ſurfaces of the body.

It was at that time generally allowed that all the ſurfaces of the body are bibulous, or provided with abſorbent veſſels, by which mercury applied to the ſkin, collections of water in the breaſt, belly, or in the cellular membrane, &c. are occaſionally taken up and conveyed into the circulation. That the lymphatic veins perform this office, he thought probable, from having obſerved that he had not been able to inject them like other veins, by filling the arterial ſyſtem; and from having ſometimes remarked in injecting, that they were immediately filled with wax, when the arteries burſt, and the wax was effuſed into the cellular membrane. But what appeared to him to be the moſt ſtriking argument in ſupport of his opi-

nion was the analogy between the lymphatics and lacteals. Theſe two ſyſtems were to all appearance, the ſame in their coats, in their valves, in their manner of ramifying, in their paſſage through the lymphatic or conglobate glands, and in their termination in the thoracic duct. As they were perfectly ſimilar, in every other reſpect, he ſuppoſed them to be ſo in their origin and uſe. The lacteals were known to begin from the ſurface of the inteſtines, and to be the abſorbents of thoſe parts. Hence he concluded, that there was no difference between them but in their names, and that the ſame veſſels were called *lacteals* in the inteſtines, and lymphatics in the other parts of the body. This doctrine explained the uſe of valves in the lymphatics. In other veins, the fluid was ſuppoſed to move onward by an impetus received in the arterial ſyſtem; but the caſe could not be the ſame in veſſels that imbibe a fluid from a ſurface.—Theſe ideas concerning the lymphatics were farther confirmed by the abſorption and progreſs of the venereal poiſon.

Such were the opinions maintained by Dr. Hunter in his lectures in the year 1746.—Dr. Monro

Monro in his Inaugural Diſſertation ‖, printed in 1755, introduced ſeveral arguments to prove that the valvular lymphatic veſſels, through the whole body, are a ſyſtem of abſorbent veins; and that they do not proceed from the branches of arteries as was the common opinion: and two years afterwards in a work on the lymphatics †, publiſhed at Berlin, he treats fully of their origin, ſtructure, and uſe, and quotes many of the lateſt writers to prove that his opinions on this ſubject were new.

Neither Dr. Hunter nor Dr. Monro ſeem to have been aware that the main points for which they contended are to be found in an abridgement of anatomy §, publiſhed at Paris ſo early

‖ Diſſertatio Inauguralis de Teſtibus et Semine in variis animalibus.

† De Venis Lymphaticis valvuloſis et de earum imprimis origine.

§ L'Anatomie du Corps de l'homme en abrégé; par M. Noguez, Medecin du Roy, et Demonſtrateur d'hiſtoire naturelle au Jardin Royal, 8vo Paris. 2d edition, 1726.——The firſt edition of this work, publiſhed in 1723, was little more than a tranſlation of Keil's anatomy, but this ſecond edition contains many obſervations peculiar to the author, and, among others, thoſe which I have quoted relative to the lymphatics.

as the year 1726, by M. Noguez, a French anatomiſt. This work, which is at preſent but little known, contains ſeveral paſſages that have been overlooked by ſucceeding writers, but which clearly prove that the author was not unacquainted with the abſorbing office of the lymphatic veins, and their analogy to the lacteals. Theſe paſſages, however, had not eſcaped the notice of Mr. Henry Watſon, who firſt mentioned them to me, and was ſo kind as to lend me the book.

In the eighth chapter of the third part of his work, M. Noguez, after having given a good account of the lacteals and their valves, and likewiſe of the thoracic duct, deſcribes the lymphatics in the following terms: " La ſtructure " des vaiſſeaux lymphatiques et la maniere de " les demontrer ſont les memes que dans les " veines lactées... Les vaiſſeaux lymphatiques " ſont des vaiſſeaux tres petits; minces, tranſ- " parens, qui renferment ordinairement une " liqueur aqueuſe qu'on appelle lymphe.... " on les trouve d'ordinaire à la ſurface des par- " ties, ſur tout du foye. Leur ſtructure et " leur ſubſtance ne different point des veines " lactées. Ils ont beaucoup de valvules qui " ſont doubles et ſemi-lunaires, et qui ſont d'un

grand

" grand uſage pour faciliter le mouvement pro-
" greſſif de la lymphe. Ruyſch les a parfaite-
" ment bien decrites et demontrées. Il en nait
" de preſque toutes les parties du corps, ou
" peut-etre de toutes les parties: la choſe eſt
" encore indeciſe. . . Pour les demontrer il faut
" lier la veine thoracique, la veine cave, ou
" quelqu' autre gros tronc dans un animal vi-
" vant, ou tué depuis peu: on ſouffle enſuite
" dans les veines, ou dans les arteres, ou dans
" les tuyaux excretoires des viſceres. . .Il y'a des
" glandes qu'on appelle *conglobées*, ou les vaiſ-
" ſeaux lymphatiques aboutiſſent, et qui ſervent
" d'entrepots*." He allows the exiſtence of lym-

* " The ſtructure of the lymphatic veſſels, and the
" manner of demonſtrating them are the ſame as in the
" lacteal veins. . .The lymphatic veſſels are very minute
" veſſels; thin, tranſparent, and uſually containing a
" watery liquor called lymph. . . .They are commonly
" found on the ſurface of parts, particularly of the
" liver. In their ſtructure and compoſition they are
" the ſame as the lacteal veins. They have a great
" number of valves which are double and ſemi-lunar,
" and which are of great utility to facilitate the pro-
" greſſive motion of the lymph. Ruyſch has deſcribed
" and demonſtrated them perfectly well. They ariſe from
" almoſt all parts of the body, or perhaps from every
" part; but this is as yet undetermined. . . .To demon-
" ſtrate

lymphatic arteries which exhale a ſubtile vapour or lymph, but he is careful to diſtinguiſh theſe from the *lymphatic veins*, which he conſiders as *abſorbents*. "Les premiers—ſays he—naiſſent "des extremitez arterieles, comme dans l'oeil, "à la peau: on les nomment arteres lympha- "tiques, qui peut-être ne ſont autre choſe que "les conduits excretoires d'une lymphe tres "ſubtile, ou de la matiere de la tranſpiration. "Les ſeconds vaiſſeaux lymphatiques ſont vei- "neux; ils reportent la lymphe dans les vaiſ- "ſeaux ſanguins ou dans les veines; il y'en a "dans toutes les parties du corps; ils repom- "pent la matiere lymphatique qui s'evacue par "les premiers, on peut les nommer conduits "abſorbans*."—There is certainly a great dif-

"ſtrate them, we muſt firſt tie the thoracic duct, the "vena cava, or ſome other large trunk in a living ani- "mal, or one recently killed; and then blow into the "veins or the arteries, or the excretory ducts of the "viſcera.—There are glands called *conglobate*, where "the lymphatic veſſels enter, and which ſerve as "reſervoirs."

* "The firſt ariſe from the extremities of arteries as "in the eye, and in the ſkin. Theſe may be called "lymphatic arteries, and are perhaps no other than the

difference between this ſtate of the diſcovery, and the progreſs that has ſince been made in it by injecting the lymphatic veins with mercury, tracing their origin and courſe in different parts of the body, explaining their ſtructure and uſe, and applying the doctrine of abſorption to pathology. For theſe improvements we are indebted to Dr. Hunter, Dr. Monro, Mr. Hewſon, and other modern anatomiſts; but the paſſages I have juſt now quoted are ſufficient to ſhew, that in a hiſtory of the abſorbent ſyſtem our obligations to M. Noguez ought not to be forgotten.

Speaking of diſlocations * Dr. Hunter delivers what he ſuppoſed at the time to be a new doctrine, viz. that when a luxation is produced by violence in a healthy ſtate, the capſular ligament is lacerated. But it has been ſince ob-

" excretory ducts of a very ſubtile lymph, or of the " matter of perſpiration. The ſecond lymphatic veſſels " are venous, and carry back the lymph into the blood " veſſels or veins. They are to be met with in all parts " of the body. *They ſuck up the lymphatic fluid which " is evacuated by the former, and may be called abſorbing " veſſels.*"

* Med. Comm. ch. 7.

ſerved,

ſerved †, that a ſimilar opinion was adopted long ago by Petit ‖.

In the courſe of his work Dr. Hunter takes occaſion to treat * of the inſenſibility of the dura mater, perioſteum, tendons, and ligaments. On this ſubject he profeſſes to have delivered nearly the ſame doctrine in his lectures in 1746, as was afterwards publiſhed by Haller in 1752. The juſt claim, however, of Haller to the thanks of the world for this diſcovery, as he made it fairly, and was the firſt who communicated it to the public, has never been diſputed. It deſerves to be remarked, however, that Dr. Hunter differs in ſome reſpects from Haller, who has gone too far, he thinks, in concluding that theſe parts have abſolutely *no ſenſe* of feeling; and who ſeems to have been led into an error in ſurgery, by ſuppoſing that wounds and punctures of tendons and ligaments, and penetrating wounds in the joints, are attended with as little danger as ſimilar wounds in fleſhy parts. Dr. Hunter very prudently cautions his readers againſt cutting into the cavity of a joint, unleſs there be very urgent reaſon for ſo dangerous a practice.

† Kirkland's Obſ. on Fractures, &c. p. 48.

‖ Traité des Maladies des Os. tom. I. p. 46.

* Med. Comm. ch. 8.

What he ſays of abſorption by veins is founded chiefly on experiments made and related by his brother, Mr. John Hunter, and which, in his opinion, prove that in the human body the red veins do not abſorb.

With regard to the *hernia congenita* Dr. Hunter acknowledges that he firſt learned from Mr. Sharpe, in 1748, that caſes of rupture ſometimes occur, where the inteſtine is found in the ſame ſac, and in contact with the *teſtis*. The truth of this he afterwards confirmed by his own obſervation, but till he read the account of the *hernia congenita* in Haller's *opuſcula pathologica* *, he had conſtantly accounted for this phenomenon by ſuppoſing that the hernial ſac had been lacerated. He now engaged his brother to proſecute inquiries on this ſubject, and to this circumſtance we are indebted for the "Obſervations † on the ſtate of the *teſtis* in the "fœtus,

* This work was publiſhed in 1754, but the account of the hernia congenita had appeared in a ſeparate publication in 1749, and Haller had made the diſcovery ſo early as 1747.

† "Nos quidem teſtes in abdomine fœtus habitare, "ſerius in ſcrotum deſcendere vidimus, et aliquando "peritonæum foramine patuiſſe, per quod teſtis exiret.

"Accu-

" fœtus, and on the hernia congenita, by Mr. " John Hunter," which are publiſhed in the Medical Commentaries.

No man was ever more tenacious than Dr. Hunter of what he conceived to be his anatomical rights. This was particularly evinced in the year 1780, when his brother communicated to the Royal Society a diſcovery he had made twenty-five years before relative to the ſtructure of the placenta, the communication between it and the uterus, and the vaſcularity of the ſpongy chorion.

At the next meeting of the Society, a letter was read in which Dr. Hunter put in his claim to the diſcovery in queſtion. This letter was followed by a reply from Mr. John Hunter, and here † the diſpute ended.

In 1762, when our preſent amiable queen became pregnant, Dr. Hunter was conſulted; and

" Accuratius hæc Johannes Hunter, Gulielmi frater, " expoſuit, addidit, ut debilis celluloſa tela cedat, " teſtem tranſmittat, peritonæum vero ſupra tranſitum " confirmet. Hæc bonis iconibus exprimit." Halleri *Biblioth. Anatom.* tom. II. p. 363.

† Theſe papers, though not publiſhed by the Society, are preſerved in their archives.

two years afterwards ‖ he had the honour to be appointed Phyſician Extraordinary to her Majeſty. In courts, where intereſt too often prevails over merit, appointments of this ſort are not always conferred on perſons of the greateſt abilities. But it is certain that Dr. Hunter owed his nomination to this important office ſolely to his own well-earned reputation, and his aſſiduity and uniform ſucceſs in the diſcharge of it ſhewed how well he deſerved it.

About this time his avocations were ſo numerous that he became deſirous of leſſening his fatigue, and having noticed the ingenuity and aſſiduous application of the late Mr. William Hewſon, F. R. S. †, who was then one of his pupils,

‖ 1764.

† Of the life of this ingenious anatomiſt no account had been printed, till my learned friend Dr. Hahn, profeſſor of phyſic in the univerſity of Leyden, prefixed ſome anecdotes of him to a Latin tranſlation of his works lately publiſhed in that city, but which I have not yet ſeen. Theſe anecdotes are contained in the following letter with which Mr. Hewſon's widow favoured me, in reply to one I had addreſſed to her at the ſuggeſtion of our common friend Mr. Watſon, F.R.S. This letter I tranſmitted to Dr. Hahn, who tells me he has given it entire in a Latin tranſlation; and it affords ſo affec-

pupils, he engaged him firſt as an aſſiſtant and afterwards as a partner in his lectures. This con-

affectionate and juſt a tribute to the memory of Mr. Hewſon, that I am perſuaded my readers will be pleaſed to ſee it preſerved here in its original form.

" SIR,

" I ſhould think myſelf bound to grant any requeſt " introduced with Mr. Watſon's name; but that which " you make in the letter I received yeſterday needed " no ſuch introduction. A tribute paid to the memory " of Mr. Hewſon is highly gratifying to me, and I " can have no employment that will give me more ſa- " tisfaction than that of aſſiſting in any degree to the " ſpreading of his fame.

" You ſay, you are not unacquainted with the ge- " neral hiſtory of Mr. Hewſon's life, and you ſpeak " of him in terms which ſhew you are not unacquaint- " ed with his character. Had you been among the " number of his friends, you would bear teſtimony to " his private virtues, which rendered him no leſs dear " to his family and aſſociates, than his talents made " him reſpectable in the world.

" Mr. Hewſon was born at Hexham in Northum- " berland, on the 14th of November, O. S. 1739. He " received the rudiments of his education at a gram- " mar ſchool in that town, under the Rev. Mr. Brown. " His father was a ſurgeon and apothecary in the place, " and much reſpected in that neighbourhood. With

" him

connexion continued till the year 1770, when ſome diſputes happened, which terminated in a ſepa-

" him Mr. Hewſon acquired his firſt medical know-
" ledge. Being ambitious to increaſe that knowledge,
" he placed himſelf firſt under an eminent ſurgeon in
" Newcaſtle (Mr. Lambert) and afterwards reſided for
" ſome time at London, Edinburgh, and Paris. His
" ſubſequent acquirements are ſufficient to prove, that
" he viſited thoſe places with a true love of ſcience and
" deſire of attaining eminence in his profeſſion.

" I became acquainted with him in the year 1768.
" He was at that time in partnerſhip with Dr. Hunter.
" Some ſimilarity in our diſpoſitions created a mutual
" eſteem, and the equality of our ſituations made our
" union deſirable in point of prudence. I had five
" months the ſtart of him in age, no pretenſions to
" beauty, nor any ſplendid fortune; yet I believe he
" was ſatisfied with the choice he made. We were
" married July 10th 1770. I brought him two ſons.
" The elder was juſt three years old when Mr. Hewſon
" died, which was on the firſt of May 1774, and I was
" delivered of a daughter on the ninth of Auguſt fol-
" lowing. His laſt moments of recollection were em-
" bittered by the idea of leaving me with three chil-
" dren but ſcantily provided for. The trial of my
" fortitude was different; the loſs of affluence I did
" not feel for myſelf, and I thought I could bring up
" my children not to want it. However, by the death
" of an aunt, who left me her fortune, I became re-
" inſtated

ſeparation. Mr. Hewſon was ſucceeded in the partnerſhip

" inſtated in eaſy circumſtances, and am enabled to
" give a liberal education to my children, who I hope
" will prove worthy of the ſtock from which they grew,
" and do honour to the name of Hewſon.

" Mr. Hewſon's mother is ſtill living at Hexham,
" and has one daughter, the youngeſt and only remain-
" ing child of eleven.

" His father died in 1767; and having had ſo large
" a family, it will be readily ſuppoſed he could not
" give much to his ſon, ſo that Mr. Hewſon's advance-
" ment in life was owing to his own induſtry.

" A better ſon and huſband, or a fonder father than
" Mr. Hewſon, never exiſted. He was honoured with
" the friendſhip of many reſpectable perſons now liv-
" ing, and the late Sir John Pringle ſhewed him ſin-
" gular marks of regard.

" Mr. Hewſon's manners were gentle and engaging;
" his ambition was free from oſtentation, his prudence
" was without meanneſs, and he was more covetous of
" fame than of fortune.

" You will, I truſt, readily forgive me, if I have
" been more prolix than you deſired. It would be no
" eaſy matter for me to relate bare facts without ſome
" comment upon ſuch a ſubject.

" I am, SIR,

Kenſington, " Your moſt obedient humble ſervant,
Aug. 30, 1782. " MARY HEWSON."

To this letter I take the liberty to add, that the writer of it, whoſe ſentiments do her ſo much honour,

partnerſhip by Mr. Cruikſhank, whoſe anatomical abilities are deſervedly reſpected.

In 1767* Dr. Hunter was elected a fellow of the Royal Society, and the year following communicated to that learned body obſervations on the bones †, commonly ſuppoſed to be elephants bones, which have been found near the river Ohio in America.

Naturaliſts had entertained very different opinions concerning foſſil ivory, and the large teeth and bones dug up in different parts of the world. When they were clearly aſcertained to be parts of animals, (for at firſt this was doubted) a diſpute aroſe to what animal they belonged. The more general opinion was, that they were the bones of the elephant; but this was liable to great objections. The bones were obſerved to be larger than thoſe of the elephant, and it was thought ſtrange that elephants ſhould have been

is the lady to whom Dr. Franklin has addreſſed ſeveral of his letters on Philoſophical ſubjects, and likewiſe his ſcheme for a new Alphabet and reformed mode of Spelling, publiſhed in the collection of his Political, Miſcellaneous and Philoſophical pieces.

* April 30.

† Philoſ. Tranſactions, vol. 58.

formerly

formerly ſo numerous in weſtern countries where they are no longer natives, and in cold countries, Siberia particularly, where they cannot now live.

Of late years the ſame ſort of tuſks and teeth, with ſome other larger bones, have been found in conſiderable number near the banks of the Ohio in North America. The French academicians became poſſeſſed of ſome ſpecimens of them, and having compared them with the bones of real elephants, and with thoſe which had been brought to France from Siberia, determined with an appearance of truth on their ſide that they were elephants bones.

This part of natural knowledge appeared to Dr. Hunter to be very curious and intereſting, inaſmuch as it ſeemed to concur with many other phænomena, in proving, that in former times ſome aſtoniſhing change muſt have happened to this terraqueous globe; that the higheſt mountains, in moſt countries, now known, muſt have lain for many ages in the bottom of the ſea; and that this earth muſt have been ſo changed with reſpect to climates, that countries, which are now intenſely cold, muſt have been formerly

inhabited by animals that are now confined to the warm climates.

After examining a great number of theſe teeth and bones, and carefully reading what had been publiſhed on this ſubject by M. M. de Buffon and d'Aubenton *, Dr. Hunter was convinced that the ſuppoſed American elephant was an animal of another ſpecies which naturaliſts were unacquainted with. He imagined further that this *animal incognitum* would prove to be the ſuppoſed elephant of Siberia and other parts of Europe, and that the real elephant would be found to have been in all ages a native of Aſia and Africa only. In the courſe of this inquiry having procured one of theſe foſſil tuſks to be cut through and poliſhed, he diſcovered that true or genuine ivory is the production of two different animals, and not of the elephant alone.

This was not the only ſubject of natural hiſtory on which Dr. Hunter employed his pen; for in a ſubſequent volume † of the Philoſophical Tranſactions, we find him offering his remarks on ſome bones found in the rock of Gibraltar,

* Hiſtoire Natur. tom. xi. & Mem. de l'Acad. des Sciences, 1762.

† Vol. 60.

and

and which he proves to have belonged to ſome quadruped. In the ſame work* likewiſe he publiſhed an account of the Nyl-ghau, an Indian animal, not deſcribed before, and which, from its ſtrength and ſwiftneſs, promiſed to be a uſeful acquiſition to this country.

In 1768 ‖ Dr. Hunter became a Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries, and the ſame year at the inſtitution of a Royal Academy of Arts, he was appointed by his majeſty to the office of Profeſſor of Anatomy. This appointment opened a new field for his abilities, and he engaged in it as he did in every other purſuit of his life, with unabating zeal. He now adapted his anatomical knowledge to the objects of painting and ſculpture, and the novelty and juſtneſs of his obſervations proved at once the readineſs and extent of his genius.

In January 1781, he was unanimouſly elected to ſucceed the late Dr. John Fothergill as preſident of this ſociety. He was one of thoſe to whom we are indebted for its eſtabliſhment, and our grateful acknowledgments are due to him for his zealous endeavours to promote the liberal views

* Phil. Tranſ. vol. 61.

‖ Jan. 14.

of

of this inſtitution, by rendering it a ſource of mutual improvement, and thus making it ultimately uſeful to the public.

As his name and talents were known and reſpected in every part of Europe, ſo the honours conferred on him were not limited to his own country. In 1780 the Royal Medical Society at Paris elected him one of their foreign aſſociates; and in 1782 he received a ſimilar mark of diſtinction from the Royal Academy of Sciences in that city.

We come now to the moſt ſplendid of Dr. Hunter's medical publications, the Anatomy of the Human Gravid Uterus. The appearance of this work, which had been begun ſo early as the year 1751, (at which time ten of the thirty-four plates it contains were completed) was retarded till the year 1775, only by the author's deſire of ſending it into the world with fewer imperfections. Something concerning the progreſs of this work, and of the zeal with which it was proſecuted, may be collected from different parts of his letter to profeſſor Monro, ſenior, in the Supplement to his Medical Commentaries, "On the 11th of February—ſays he—I was ſo "fortunate as to meet with a Gravid Uterus, "to which, from that time, all the hours have

"been

" been dedicated, which have been at my own " diſpoſal. I have been buſy in injecting, diſ- " ſecting, preſerving, and ſhewing it, and in " planning and ſuperintending drawings and " plaiſter caſts of it. I have already made five " very capital drawings from this ſubject. They " and ſome more, ſhall be engraved by the beſt " maſters, as ſoon as poſſible, and then the " whole ſhall be publiſhed. My firſt and ori- " ginal intention, you know, was to have pub- " liſhed ten plates only; but thinking the work " imperfect, I waited patiently for more oppor- " tunities of adding ſupplemental figures. Six- " teen plates were finiſhed on this plan ſeveral " years ago; but ſtill I was diſſatisfied with the " work, as being incomplete; and in ſpite of " the importunity of many friends, I kept it " from the public."

Opportunities of diſſecting the Human Gravid Uterus occur but ſeldom. It was probably owing to this circumſtance that this part of anatomy had been leſs ſucceſsfully cultivated than ſome others. Few, or none, of the anatomiſts, had met with a ſufficient number of ſubjects, either for inveſtigating, or demonſtrating the principal circumſtances of Utero-geſtation in the human ſpecies.

In

In the courſe of near thirty years, by great diligence, and the aſſiſtance of many friends, Dr. Hunter procured in this metropolis ſo many opportunities of ſtudying the Gravid Uterus, as to be enabled to exhibit, by figures, all the principal changes that occur in the nine months of pregnancy.

This great work is dedicated to the King. In his preface to it we find the author very candidly acknowledging that in moſt of the diſſections he had been aſſiſted by his brother, Mr. John Hunter, "whoſe accuracy—he adds—in anatomical reſearches is ſo well known, that to "omit this opportunity of thanking him for "that aſſiſtance would be in ſome meaſure to "diſregard the future reputation of the work "itſelf." He likewiſe confeſſes his obligations to the ingenious artiſts who made the drawings and engravings, "but particularly to Mr. "Strange, not only for having by his hand ſe"cured a ſort of immortality to two of the "plates, but for having given his advice and "aſſiſtance in every part with a ſteady and diſ"intereſted friendſhip."

The plates are not all of them equally intereſting or beautiful, but I believe their accuracy has never been diſputed. The four firſt

engrav-

engravings by Strange and Ravenet, and those of the Ovum in early pregnancy by Worlidge, are justly admired for their elegance.

In this work Dr. Hunter first delineated the Retroverted Uterus, and the *Membrana decidua reflexa*, or that part of the spongy chorion which is reflected over the fœtus, and for the discovery of which we are indebted to him.

After the last plate was finished, he had an opportunity of procuring drawings to be made from a younger embryo than he had till then seen, and likewise from a very curious case of a conception in the Fallopian tube, which confirmed two opinions he had before entertained concerning the Gravid Uterus. It shewed, that the enlargement of the impregnated Uterus does not happen mechanically from the increasing bulk of its contents; and it proved, at the same time, that the spongy chorion, or *membrana decidua*, belongs to the Uterus, and not to the Ovum or that part of the conception which is brought from the Ovarium. These drawings he intended to have offered to the public in the way of a supplemental plate, or with the description of the anatomy of the Gravid Uterus, a work which he did not live to publish, but which he seems to have almost completely prepared for

 the

the preſs. This deſcription * was intended to be printed in quarto, as an illuſtration of his plates. The two works united would certainly convey as accurate an idea of the anatomy of the Gravid Uterus, as can be acquired without the actual diſſection of pregnant women. This anatomical deſcription of the Gravid Uterus was not the only work which Dr. Hunter had in contemplation to give to the public. He had long been employed in collecting and arranging

* Some idea may be formed of the plan of this intended work from the following view of its contents and their arrangement, written by the author himſelf: "Size of the Uterus at Nine Months.——Figure.—— "Situation.——Ligaments, Tubes, and Ovaria.—— "Thickneſs of the Uterus.——Blood-veſſels.——Lym- "phatics and Nerves.——Muſcular Fibres.——Os "Uteri.——Contents of the Uterus.——Navel String. "——Placenta.——Membranes Amnios, Chorion and "Decidua.——Allantois and Urachus.——Liquor Am- "nii.——Fœtus; its Situation, Size, Form, &c.——Of "the Pregnant Uterus in the earlier Months.——How "far back in Pregnancy my Obſervations go.——Sub- "ſtance of the Uterus ſofter, more vaſcular, and rather "thicker.——The Conception then altogether in the "Fundus.—State of the Cervix Uteri.——State of the "Os Uteri.—Uterus not tight nor quite full.——Situ- "ation of the Ligaments of the Uterus.——Ovarium "and Corpus Luteum."

mate-

materials for a hiſtory of the various concretions that are formed in the human body. In this work he intended to comprehend not only urinary and biliary concretions, but likewiſe thoſe which take place in the ſalivary glands, pancreas, proſtate, &c. Of the urinary and biliary concretions he meant to treat at conſiderable length, becauſe they are by much the moſt common; of the others, as being leſs frequent, he intended to treat more ſlightly.

He ſeems to have advanced no farther in the execution of this deſign, than to have nearly completed that part of it which relates to urinary and biliary concretions. Of theſe he deſcribes the mechanical properties, as their ſpecific gravity, colour, ſize, ſhape, &c. and their chymical properties diſcoverable by experiments. He conſiders likewiſe their mode of growth, and adds a ſhort account of their pathology. It is probable that he meant to treat of the other concretions in the ſame way. This work was intended to be illuſtrated by engravings. The greater number of theſe were finiſhed at the time of his death, and are executed with uncommon elegance.

Amongſt Dr. Hunter's papers have likewiſe been found two introductory lectures, which are written out ſo fairly, and with ſuch accuracy,

that he probably intended no farther correction of them before they ſhould be given to the world. In theſe lectures Dr. Hunter traces the hiſtory of anatomy from the earlieſt to the preſent times, along with the general progreſs of ſcience and the arts. He conſiders the great utility of anatomy in the practice of phyſic and ſurgery; gives the ancient diviſions of the different ſubſtances compoſing the human body, which for a long time prevailed in anatomy; points out the moſt advantageous mode of cultivating this branch of natural knowledge; and concludes with explaining the particular plan of his own lectures.

Beſides theſe manuſcripts he has alſo left behind him a conſiderable number of caſes of diſſection; moſt of them relate to pregnant women, and they are written with tolerable accuracy.

The ſame year in which the tables of the Gravid Uterus made their appearance, Dr. Hunter communicated to the Royal Society, an Eſſay on the origin of the Venereal Diſeaſe. In this paper he attempted to prove, that this dreadful malady was not brought from America to Europe by the crew of Columbus, as had been commonly

monly ſuppoſed, although it made its firſt appearance about that period.

In order to ſupport this opinion, Dr. Hunter pointed out ſeveral inaccuracies in Aſtruc's teſtimonies, which contradict his aſſertion that the venereal infection firſt made its appearance between the years 1494 and 1496. In particular he obſerved, that Fulgoſius, one of the writers to whom Aſtruc appeals, poſitively ſays, that this diſeaſe made its appearance two years before Charles the Eighth's arrival in Italy, which would fix it to 1492. But the authority on which Dr. Hunter laid the greateſt ſtreſs, was that of Peter Martyr *, a native of Italy, who went to Spain in 1487, and reſided there till his death, which happened in 1525. His talents ſoon procured him the patronage of the court, and he was appointed one of the council for the direction of affairs in the Weſt Indies. He was the intimate friend of Columbus, and beſides other works was the author of a hiſtory of the Diſcovery of America. His letters, which were

* This writer muſt not be confounded with another of the ſame name, and likewiſe a native of Italy, who was profeſſor of divinity at Oxford, and died at Zurich in 1562.

pub-

publiſhed after his death, are full of information about the New World, but no where does he take notice of the venereal diſeaſe being conveyed from thence, though he often ſpeaks of that complaint as a new diſeaſe which had juſt made its appearance, and which he aſcribes, agreeably to the philoſophy of thoſe times, to planetary influence. One of his letters, addreſſed to Arias Luritanus, profeſſor of Greek at Salamanca, who was afflicted with this new diſeaſe, is dated in 1489, which was before Columbus even ſailed from Spain on his firſt voyage.

After this paper had been read to the Royal Society, Dr. Hunter, in a converſation with the late Dr. Muſgrave, was convinced that the teſtimony on which he placed his chief dependence was of leſs weight than he had at firſt imagined, as many of Martyr's letters afford the moſt convincing proofs of their having been written a conſiderable time after the period of their dates. He therefore very properly laid aſide his intention of giving his Eſſay to the public.

In the year 1777, Dr. Hunter joined with Mr. Watſon in preſenting to the Royal Society a ſhort Account of the late Dr. Maty's Illneſs, and

of

of the Appearances on Diſſection *; and the year following he publiſhed his Reflections on the Section of the Symphyſis Pubis. This Eſſay, which was firſt read by the author at one of the quarterly meetings of this Society, contains a great number of uſeful obſervations. By ſending forth this work Dr. Hunter did not mean to raiſe a popular cry againſt this new practice, before it was well underſtood, for he thought that this would be unfair, and at the ſame time diſreſpectful to the ingenuity, and, no doubt, humane intentions, of Meſſieurs Sigault, Camper, and Le Roy, the authors of the operation. All that he wiſhed for was to ſee it received with caution, and finally approved or rejected upon ſolid ground, and at as little expence to human nature as poſſible.

The merits of this invention have lately been more fully inveſtigated by Dr. Oſborn †, who has ſo clearly aſcertained its inutility and danger that it will probably never be attempted in this country.

* Phil. Tranſ. vol. 67.

† An Eſſay on Laborious Parturition; in which the diviſion of the Symphyſis Pubis is particularly conſidered. 8vo. Lond. 1783.

We

We muſt now go back a little in the order of time to deſcribe the origin and progreſs of Dr. Hunter's Muſeum, without ſome account of which the hiſtory of his life would be very incomplete.

When he began to practiſe midwifery, he was deſirous of acquiring a fortune ſufficient to place him in eaſy and independent circumſtances. Before many years had elapſed he found himſelf in poſſeſſion of a ſum adequate to his wiſhes in this reſpect, and this he ſet apart as a reſource of which he might avail himſelf whenever age or infirmities ſhould oblige him to retire from buſineſs. I have heard him ſay, that he once took a conſiderable ſum from this fund for the purpoſes of his muſeum, but that he did not feel himſelf perfectly at eaſe till he had reſtored it again. After he had obtained this competency, as his wealth continued to accumulate, he formed a laudable deſign of engaging in ſome ſcheme of public utility, and at firſt had it in contemplation to found an anatomical ſchool in this metropolis. For this purpoſe, about the year 1765, during the adminiſtration of Mr. Grenville, he preſented a memorial to that miniſter, in which he requeſted the grant of a piece of ground in the Mews for the ſcite of an anato-

mical

mical theatre. Dr. Hunter undertook to expend ſeven thouſand pounds on the building, and to endow a profeſſorſhip of anatomy in perpetuity. This ſcheme did not meet with the reception it deſerved.—In a converſation on this ſubject ſoon afterwards with the Earl of Shelburne, his lordſhip expreſſed a wiſh that the plan might be carried into execution by ſubſcription, and very generouſly requeſted to have his name ſet down for a thouſand guineas. Dr. Hunter's delicacy would not allow him to adopt this propoſal. He choſe rather to execute it at his own expence, and accordingly purchaſed a ſpot of ground in Great Windmill-ſtteet, where he erected a ſpacious houſe, to which he removed from Jermyn-ſtreet in 1770.

In this building, beſides a handſome amphitheatre and other convenient apartments for his lectures and diſſections, there was one magnificent room, fitted up with great elegance and propriety as a muſeum.

Of the magnitude and value of his anatomical collection, ſome idea may be formed when we conſider the great length of years he employed in the making of anatomical preparations, and in the diſſection of morbid bodies, added to the eagerneſs with which he procured

additions from the collections of Sandys*, Hewſon †, Falconar ‖, Blackall §, and others that were at different times offered for ſale in this metropolis. His ſpecimens of rare diſeaſes were likewiſe frequently increaſed by preſents from his medical friends and pupils, who, when any thing of this ſort occurred to them, very juſtly thought they could not diſpoſe of it more properly than by placing it in Dr. Hunter's muſeum. Speaking of an acquiſition in this way, in one of his publications, he ſays, "I look "upon every thing of this kind which is given "to me, as a preſent to the public; and con-

* See page 14.

† See page 38.

‖ Magnus Falconar, ſurgeon, was born at Cheltenham in Glouceſterſhire, in Nov. 1751. He married a ſiſter of Mr. Hewſon, and ſucceeded him as a reader on anatomy in London. He died of a pulmonary conſumption at Briſtol, March 24, 1778, at the age of 24 years. He was a man of great application and dexterity, and a good ſpeaker. The ſale of his collection of anatomical preparations, which included thoſe made by Mr. Hewſon, produced upwards of nine hundred pounds.

§ Andrew Blackall, a young anatomiſt of great abilities, was a native of Ireland, and began to teach anatomy in London in 1778, ſoon after the death of Mr. Falconar. He died at Briſtol Hot Wells, Aug. 14, 1780, of a pulmonary conſumption in his 27th year.

"ſider

"ſider myſelf as thereby called upon to ſerve "the public with more diligence*."

Before his removal to Windmill-ſtreet, he had confined his collection chiefly to ſpecimens of human and comparative anatomy, and of diſeaſes, but now he extended his views to foſſils, and likewiſe to the promotion of polite literature and erudition.

In a ſhort ſpace of time he became poſſeſſed of "the moſt magnificent treaſure of Greek "and Latin books that has been accumulated "by any perſon now living, ſince the days of "Mead." This is the character given of the doctor's library by a learned and induſtrious writer †, who records an anecdote ‖ which does honour to Dr. Hunter's ſkill in bibliography.

* Letter to Dr. Vaughan, prefixed to the Reflections relative to the operation of cutting the Symphyſis of the Oſſa Pubis.

† Edward Harwood, D.D. in the preface to the *firſt edition* of his View of the various editions of the Greek and Roman claſſics. In this preface the author acknowledges his obligations to Dr. Hunter for having been allowed free acceſs to conſult any curious editions he wanted to inſpect in his muſeum. In a ſubſequent edition this and ſeveral other paſſages where Dr. Hunter's name occurs, are ſuppreſſed.

‖ "I have only to regret that I did not happen to

A cabinet of ancient medals contributed likewiſe much to the richneſs of his muſeum. A deſcription * of part of the coins, in this collection, ſtruck by the Greek free cities, has lately been publiſhed by the doctor's learned friend

" ſee, till after the article of Theocritus was printed " off, a very curious *editio princeps* of this poet in Dr. " Hunter's muſeum, in which the doctor, upon care- " fully collating two copies, as he imagined of the " ſame edition, printed at Venice, Gr. fol. 1495, diſ- " covered a material difference not noticed by any bi- " bliographer. The doctor ingeniouſly accounted for " it, by ſuppoſing it to be printed from a mutilated " manuſcript, and that Aldus, after having diſpoſed " of a few copies of this imperfect edition, in the mean " time meeting with a completer manuſcript, ſupplied " the deficiency of thoſe copies which remained unſold, " by printing two or three new ſheets, and inſerting " them in the work. This curious circumſtance rela- " tive to this edition of Theocritus, by Aldus, appears " to have been unknown to the ingenious editor of the " late Oxford edition of Theocritus, and will undoubt- " edly induce learned men to inſpect this uncommon " book." This is another of the paſſages omitted by Dr. Harwood in a late edition of his work.

* Nummorum veterum populorum et urbium qui in muſeo Gulielmi Hunter aſſervantur deſcriptio figuris illuſtrata. Opera et ſtudio Caroli Combe, S. R. et S. A. ſoc. 4to Londini 1783.

Mr.

Mr. Combe. In a claſſical dedication of this elegant volume to the queen, Dr. Hunter acknowledges his obligations to her majeſty. In the preface ſome account is given of the progreſs of the collection, which has been brought together ſince the year 1770, with ſingular taſte, and at the expence of upwards of twenty thouſand pounds.

In 1781, the muſeum received a valuable addition of ſhells, corals, and other curious ſubjects of natural hiſtory which had been collected by our late worthy preſident Dr. Fothergill, who gave directions by his will that his collection ſhould be appraiſed after his death, and that Dr. Hunter ſhould have the refuſal of it at five hundred pounds under the valuation. This was accordingly done, and Dr. Hunter purchaſed it for the ſum of twelve hundred pounds.

The fame of this muſeum ſpread throughout Europe. Few foreigners, diſtinguiſhed for their rank or learning, viſited this metropolis without requeſting to ſee it. Men of ſcience of our own country always had eaſy acceſs to it.—Conſidered in a collective point of view it is perhaps without a rival.

Dr. Hunter, at the head of his profeſſion, honoured with the eſteem of his ſovereign, and

in

in the poſſeſſion of every thing that his reputation and wealth could confer, ſeemed now to have attained the ſummit of his wiſhes. But theſe ſources of gratification were embittered by a diſpoſition to the gout, which harraſſed him frequently during the latter part of his life, notwithſtanding his very abſtemious manner of living.

About ten years before his death his health was ſo much impaired, that, fearing he might ſoon become unfit for the fatigues of his profeſſion, he began to think of retiring to Scotland. With this view he requeſted his friends Dr. Cullen and Dr. Baillie to look out for a pleaſant eſtate for him. A conſiderable one, and ſuch as they thought would be agreeable to him, was offered for ſale about that time in the neighbourhood of Alloa. A deſcription of it was ſent to him, and met with his approbation. The price was agreed on, and the bargain ſuppoſed to be concluded. But when the title deeds of the eſtate came to be examined by Dr. Hunter's counſel in London, they were found defective, and he was adviſed not to complete the purchaſe. After this he found the expences of his muſeum increaſe ſo faſt, that he laid aſide all thoughts of retiring from practice.

This

This alteration in his plan did not tend to improve his health. In the courſe of a few years the returns of his gout became by degrees more frequent, ſometimes affecting his limbs, and ſometimes his ſtomach, but ſeldom remaining many hours in one part. Notwithſtanding this valetudinary ſtate, his ardour ſeemed to be unabated. In the laſt year of his life he was as eager to acquire new credit, and to ſecure the advantage of what he had before gained, as he could have been at the moſt enterprizing part of his life. At length, on Saturday the 15th of March 1783, after having for ſeveral days experienced a return of wandering gout, he complained of great head-ache and nauſea. In this ſtate he went to bed, and for ſeveral days felt more pain than uſual both in his ſtomach and limbs.

On the Thurſday following he found himſelf ſo much recovered that he determined to give the introductory lecture to the operations of ſurgery. It was to no purpoſe that his friends urged to him the impropriety of ſuch an attempt. He was determined to make the experiment, and accordingly delivered the lecture, but towards the concluſion his ſtrength was ſo exhauſted that he fainted away, and was obliged to be carried

to

to bed by two ſervants. The following night and day his ſymptoms were ſuch as indicated danger; and on Saturday morning Mr. Combe, who made him an early viſit, was alarmed on being told by Dr. Hunter himſelf, that during the night he had certainly had a paralytic ſtroke. As neither his ſpeech nor his pulſe were affected, and he was able to raiſe himſelf in bed, Mr. Combe encouraged him to hope that he was miſtaken. But the event proved the doctor's idea of his complaint to be but too well founded; for from that time till his death, which happened on Sunday the 30th of March, he voided no urine without the aſſiſtance of the catheter, which was occaſionally introduced by his brother; and purgative medicines were adminiſtered repeatedly without procuring a paſſage by ſtool. Theſe circumſtances, and the abſence of pain, ſeemed to ſhew that the inteſtines and urinary bladder had loſt their ſenſibility and power of contraction; and it was reaſonable to preſume that a partial palſy had affected the nerves diſtributed to thoſe parts.

The latter moments of his life exhibited an inſtance of philoſophical calmneſs and fortitude that well deſerves to be recorded. Turning to his

his friend Mr. Combe, "If I had ſtrength enough "to hold a pen—ſaid he—I would write how "eaſy and pleaſant a thing it is to die."

By his will, the uſe of his muſeum, under the direction of truſtees, devolves to his nephew Matthew Baillie, B. A. and in caſe of his death to Mr. Cruikſhank for the term of thirty * years, at the end of which period the whole collection is bequeathed to the Univerſity of Glaſgow.

The ſum of eight thouſand pounds ſterling is left as a fund for the ſupport and augmentation of the collection.

The truſtees are Dr. George Fordyce, Dr. David Pitcairne, and Mr. Charles Combe, to each of whom Dr. Hunter has bequeathed an annuity of twenty pounds for thirty years, that is, during the period in which they will be executing the purpoſes of the will.

Dr. Hunter has likewiſe bequeathed an annuity of one hundred pounds to his ſiſter, Mrs. Baillie, during her life, and the ſum of two thouſand pounds to each of her two daughters.

* In his will Dr. Hunter had limited the term to twenty years, but in a codicil he afterwards extended it to thirty.

The reſidue of his eſtate and effects goes to his nephew.

On Saturday the 5th of April, his remains were interred in the rector's vault of St. James's church, Weſtminſter.

Of the perſon of Dr. Hunter, it may be obſerved, that he was regularly ſhaped, but of a ſlender make, and rather below a middle ſtature.

There are ſeveral good portraits of him extant. One of theſe is in an unfiniſhed painting * by Zoffany, who has repreſented him in the attitude of giving a lecture on the muſcles at the Royal Academy, ſurrounded by a groupe of academicians. Of the engraved prints of him which have appeared, I give the preference to that executed by Collyer, from the portrait by Chamberlin, in the Council Chamber of the Royal Academy. It exhibits an accurate and ſtriking reſemblance of his features.

His manner of living was extremely ſimple and frugal, and the quantity of his food was

* This picture is in the poſſeſſion of Mr. Baillie. The portrait of Dr. Hunter is the only part of it that is finiſhed. Of the other figures, Mr. Zoffany had only traced the out-lines, when he embarked for the Eaſt Indies.

ſmall

ſmall as well as plain.—He was an early riſer, and when buſineſs was over, was conſtantly engaged in his anatomical purſuits, or in his muſeum.

It has been ſaid that he was reſtrained by mere parſimony, from indulging in the luxuries and amuſements which captivate the generality of people who reſide in this great city. But he ſeems to have had no reliſh for them, and contrived to live, in the midſt of a crowd, maſter of himſelf, and of his own purſuits.—It may with truth be aſſerted, that he never ſuffered his œconomy to interfere in matters where the dignity of his character, or the intereſt of ſcience, were concerned.

There was ſomething very engaging in his manner and addreſs, and he had ſuch an appearance of attention to his patients when he was making his inquiries as could hardly fail to conciliate their confidence and eſteem.—In conſultation with his medical brethren, he delivered his opinions with diffidence and candour.—In familar converſation he was chearful and unaſſuming.

All who knew him allow that he poſſeſſed an excellent underſtanding, great readineſs of perception, a good memory, and a ſound judgment.

To theſe intellectual powers he united uncommon aſſiduity and preciſion, ſo that he was admirably fitted for anatomical inveſtigation.

As a teacher of anatomy he has been long and deſervedly celebrated.—He was a good orator, and having a clear and accurate conception of what he taught, he knew how to place in diſtinct and intelligible points of view the moſt abſtruſe ſubjects of anatomy and phyſiology. Among other methods of explaining and illuſtrating his doctrines, he uſed frequently to introduce ſome appoſite ſtory or caſe that had occurred to him in his practice, and few men had acquired a more intereſting fund of anecdotes of this kind, or related them in a more agreeable manner. He had the talent of infuſing much of his ardour into his pupils, and if anatomical knowledge is more diffuſed in this country than formerly, we are indebted for this, in a great meaſure, to his exertions.

To him, likewiſe, we owe much of the moderation and caution which now prevail amongſt diſcreet and intelligent practitioners of midwifery, in the uſe of inſtruments. "I admit—ſaid he in one of his lateſt publications †—

† Reflections relative to the operation of cutting the Symphyſis of the Oſſa Pubis.

"that the forceps may ſometimes be of ſervice,
"and may ſave either the mother or child. I
"have ſometimes uſed it with advantage, and,
"I believe, never materially hurt a mother or
"child with it, becauſe I always uſed it with
"fear and circumſpection. Yet, I am clearly
"of opinion, from all the information which I
"have been able to procure, that the forceps
"(midwifery inſtruments in general I fear) upon
"the whole, has done more harm than good."
In his lectures he had uniformly delivered the ſame excellent ſentiments.

How much he contributed to the improvement of medical ſcience in general may be collected from the conciſe view we have taken of his writings.

The munificence he diſplayed in the cauſe of ſcience has likewiſe a claim to our applauſe. —Perſons of an invidious turn of mind who ſeek to depreciate his merit in this reſpect, may perhaps endeavour to trace the motive by which he was actuated, and aſcribe to vanity what deſerves rather to be conſidered as a commendable love of fame. It is certain that Dr. Hunter ſacrificed no part of his time or his fortune to voluptuouſneſs, to idle pomp, or to any of the common objects of vanity that influence

cuse the perfidies of mankind in general. He seems to have been animated with a desire of distinguishing himself in those things which are in their nature laudable; and being a batchelor, and without views for establishing a family, he was at liberty to indulge his inclination. Let us, therefore, not with-hold the praise that is due to him; and at the same time let it be observed, that his temperance, his prudence, his persevering and eager pursuit of knowledge constitute an example which we may with advantage to ourselves, and to society, endeavour to imitate.

THE END.

MVSEVM BRITANNICVM